



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GINZBERG'S "GEONICA"

Geonica. By LOUIS GINZBERG. I. The Geonim and their Halakic Writings. II. Genizah Studies [also under the title: **שאלות ותרשבות הגאונים מן הנזירה אשר במצרים**]. (*Texts and Studies* of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, vol. I-II). New York 1909. pp. XII + 210; (5) + 425, 8°.

THE Gaonic epoch or, more exactly, the period from the completion of the Babylonian Talmud to the flourishing of an independent Jewish culture in Europe is the most momentous in the history of the Jews since the dispersion. To begin with, the Talmud then became the norm and rule of the entire Jewish life, not only of the religious but also of the social life, but the religious life itself was strongly affected and new and unknown horizons opened themselves disclosing new vistas. Various sects, above all the Karaite, undermined the power of tradition and the authority of its official bearers, while mysticism and religious philosophy endeavored to instil a new essence into Judaism, not to mention the fact that through contiguity with Arabic culture profane science penetrated more and more into the Jewish domain, fructifying and fertilizing it. In addition to these currents there were the Midrash and the Piyyut, the Masorah and philology, secular and synagogal poetry, the fixing of the calendar and the development of the liturgy, and other subjects which although not all originating at that time nor all fostered with equal intensity in Babylon, the seat of official Judaism, still were in a measure brought to an end in the Gaonic period, so that the latter impressed its stamp upon them. This period, however, was for a long time most obscure, chiefly because very few accounts of it had come down to us, and hence it became the scene of confusion for all kinds of fantastic hypotheses; but also here has the discovery of the Genizah thrown a new light on many problems, although its finds stretch chiefly over the last period of this epoch. Recent

years have indeed brought us many detailed investigations and minute inquiries concerning the Gaonic age,¹ but superior in importance to all of them is the work mentioned in the heading, for the very reason that besides many new aspects and the new treatment of old questions, to which the first volume is devoted, it offers in the second volume a fulness of new material quite unknown heretofore, which, similarly drawn from the Genizah, enriches our knowledge of the Geonim to a considerable extent.

I

The first volume is divided in two uneven parts, of which the first (pp. 1-72) deals with the institution of the Gaonate, the second (pp. 73-205) on the other hand with the halakic literature of the Geonim. Ginzberg is right in maintaining that the Geonim were not mere presidents of scholastic institutions (so Halevy in *דורות הראשונים* whose views are combatted here frequently and successfully), but representatives of an institution of authoritative standing, and that one misunderstands their essence by considering them as direct successors to the Babylonian Amoraim. On the other hand, however, it seems to me that Ginzberg emphasizes too little the importance of the Geonim in perpetuating tradition, chiefly with regard to the interpretation of the Talmud, which already Abraham b. David of Posquières pointed out in a remark adduced by Ginzberg himself at the close of this volume (p. 205). The characteristics of the Geonim as opposed to the Amoraim are threefold, according to Ginzberg. In the first place, the Talmud abounds in names of scholars who never were heads of schools, while in the Gaonic literature we find learned men only among the presidents of schools and colleges. However, Ginzberg compared here two incommensurable quantities, two totally different kinds of literature; discussions on the one hand, decisions on the other; here differences of opinion concerning the Mishnah and cognate questions, there Responsa on definite, concrete questions concerning actual occurrences in the religious and judicial practice, including difficult passages in the Talmud; and with queries of such types people naturally turned to the presidents of schools who alone were

¹ See the comprehensive account by Liber (*REJ.*, LXI, 297-316).

competent to solve them. Besides, Ginzberg himself remarks (p. 7, n. 1) that we possess Responsa also from men who, though living near to the Geonim, were no Geonim themselves. Thus Nathan, who is mentioned three times in Amram's Siddur, is no doubt Nathan Alluf, since from him comes information concerning customs which prevailed in the Academy, see fol. 37a: **והכי אמר רבינו נתן ראש ישיבה הכי נהגינו במתיבתא לומר ברכת הרב את ריבנו וכו' והכי אמר רבינו רב נתן שאין מנהג אצלנו לומר** (and also fol. 35b: **לומר רב נתן שאין מנהג אצלנו לומר** relates to the custom of the Academy). He was only called **ראש ישיבה** = **נאון** because he was designated for the position of school president, hence too it is probably he who is meant in the Responsa of Meir b. Baruk, Prague, No. 122, end (where **נאון** **רב נתן**).² Hezekiah b. Samuel, on the other hand, probably never wrote any Responsa, at any rate he is not identical with the writer of the epistle in *JQR.*, XVIII, 401, as I have demonstrated in *Riv. Isr.*, VI, 199. Eleazar Alluf, however, is necessarily the author of the Responsum **ש"ץ**, 26b, No. 23, because on any other supposition the latter baffles all understanding (see also my **ענינים שונים**, I, 53). The second point of difference between the Amoraim and Geonim Ginzberg sees in the fact that the office of the latter was restricted to a few families and that also other functionaries (as the **אב בית דין**, **ריש כלא**, and secretaries) were often recruited from these families—a fact which the pre-

² As to the two passages in **אור זרוע** (I, No. 640, fol. 176b, and III, **ספר המקצעות**, No. 373, fol. 56b), which are both derived from the **שאלה זו לפני אדונינו ורבינו נתן בריה דרבינו** **ב"ק**, and the first of which reads: **הכי אמר רב נתן גאון זצ"ל**, I am inclined to read in the first with Müller (against Ginzberg p. 31 and Marx *ZfHb.*, XIII, 73) **אחיה** for **בריה** and to understand the reference likewise to Nathan Alluf, for the **ספר המקצעות**, as far as we know now, adopted only Responsa from Geonim or from their school, hence it would have been surprising that we should not know anything of the father of Nathan b. Ḥananiah of Kairwan, who was even termed Gaon. **אחיה** was therefore changed into **בריה**, just because this Nathan b. Ḥananiah is mentioned in another passage of the **אור זרוע** (II, 422; fol. 171b). On the other hand, the passage quoted by me (**ענינים שונים**, I, 60) from the **טור אורח חיים** § 566, is to be obliterated, since here the author of the *Maḥkim* is meant (ed. Freimann, p. 17, see *ib.*, p. XX).

served data attest. The third and last differentiating feature is that the Geonim drew salaries. These, however, were probably not permanent in the beginning, for Nathan ha-Babli's remark concerning Joseph b. Jacob, Saadya's rival (*Med. Jew. Chron.*, II, 82, l. 4 from below) : **וְאֵנֶפֶךְ הַחֶק שֶׁהָיָה לוֹקַח כְּשֶׁהָיָה רֹאשׁ יְשִׁיבָה לֹא מִנְעוּהוּ** : **מִמֶּנּוּ** is valid only, as it seems, with reference to the last period, and even then the incomes grew less and less (see *JQR.*, XIX, 399). Also the change of conditions of life during the Gaonate from those of the Talmudic age should be taken into consideration, as is actually done by Joseph b. Judah in his **סֵפֶר מוֹסֵר** (ed. Bacher, p. 120) in defending the Geonim against Maimonides.

An old but exceedingly important source for the time of the Geonim is still the report of Nathan b. Isaac ha-Babli, and whoever institutes inquiries into that age must fall back on this chronicler. Ginzberg too expatiates upon him (p. 22 ff.). It so happens that also here the Genizah has furnished new material through the discovery of a fragment of this report in the Arabic language. Friedlaender who edited this fragment (*JQR.*, XVII, 747 ff.) considers the Arabic as the original, and this view, to my opinion, has not been refuted by Ginzberg. **עֹמֵד עַל** is certainly good Hebrew, and also **עֹמֵד עַל רֹאשׁוֹ** in the sense of "to stand over somebody" (comp. *Riv. Isr.*, VII, 93), and it is true that in general Arabisms do not prove that Arabic was the language of the original, but there is additional evidence in favor of an Arabic prototype, namely the additions which Friedlaender points out as missing in the Hebrew version. Wholly unacceptable, however, is Ginzberg's view that Nathan had recited his story orally in Kairwan and his auditors recorded it both in Arabic and Hebrew, for the differences in the two versions would then have been much greater. Equally improbable is the identification with a certain Nathan of Africa, who is cited in a Responsum of Meïr b. Baruk,³ for **נָתָן מֵאַפְרִיקָא** **אֲמַנְם בְּחִשּׁוֹבָה הַגְּאוֹנִים שְׁלִי כְּתוּבָה חֲשׁוֹבָה רַב** **נָתָן מֵאַפְרִיקָא** **לְ** does not mean "in a Responsum by Nathan" but "in a [Gaonic] Responsum to Nathan"; to this effect is also the passage quoted

³ Ginzberg knows this Responsum only from **מֵאֲרֻחוֹת חַיִּים**, II, 333; it is found, however, in the *Responsa*, ed. Lemberg, No. 193. Comp. in addition Büchler, *REJ.*, I, 147 ff.; my **אֲנָשֵׁי קִירוּאָן**, No. 39 and Toledano's **נֵר הַמַּעֲרֵב**, n. 221, 248.

by Ginzberg himself from שְׁעָרֵי תְּשׁוּבוֹת מֵהָרִ"ם בֵּר בְּרוּךְ, p. 193: סֵפֶר גִּדּוּל מֵחוּבֵר מֵתִשָּׁי חֲכָמֵי אֲפִרְקָא שֶׁשָּׂאֵלוּ מִנְּאוּנֵי בָבֶל, and undoubtedly the same collection is meant in both places. *Vice versa* we find also שְׂאֵלוֹת in the sense of responsa, as in the passage quoted by Ginzberg (p. 161, n. 2) from Harkavy, p. 84: שְׂאֵלוֹת אֵלּוּ מֵרַב צִמַּח: נֶאֱמַר ז' ל'.

As to the value and reliability of Nathan where he is at variance with Sherira, different views prevail. To mention but a few discrepancies, according to Sherira the opponent of the Gaon Kohen-Zedek was the Exilarch David, while to Nathan it was his predecessor Ukba; furthermore, Nathan names Amram b. Solomon and Hai b. Kiyumi as contemporary Geonim in Sura while Sherira ignores them altogether; finally, no mention is made by Nathan of Hananiah, Sherira's father and successor to Zemah b. Kafnoi. Disagreeing with Halevy whose estimate of Nathan is very low, Ginzberg follows Graetz mostly in endeavoring to rehabilitate this historian, even at the cost of very violent harmonizing methods and very doubtful combinations. Such are the attempts to prove that Ukba wanted to take away the revenues of Khorasan not from Kohen-Zedek but from Mebasser; that Nathan's words (p. 79, l. 17): לְפִי שְׁהִיָּה קְרוּבוֹ שֶׁל עֻקְבָּא רֹאשׁ גִּלּוּת: do not refer to David but to Kohen-Zedek; that the reading in Sherira's text should perhaps be דוֹד דָּוִד נִשְׂיָא, as if Sherira would say in this manner and not rather דוֹדוֹ שֶׁל דָּוִד נִשְׂיָא, and such other attempts. Similarly violent is the identification of Amram b. Solomon with Yom Tob b. Jacob and the assumption that father as well as son had double names (יֹם טוֹב עֲמָרָם and יַעֲקֹב שְׁלֹמֹה), which is improbable in those days.⁴ The analogies quoted prove nothing, for in מֵרַב בֵּר רַב אֲשִׁי, who was called טַבְיֹמִי, the word מֵרַב constitutes the title, and מִשְׁרָשִׁיָּה could very easily be turned into מֹשֶׁה (רִשִּׁי). When we do find such a double name, it is mostly due to a defective transmission, as, for instance, in the case of Joseph b. Abba whom Sherira (p. 37), Abraham b. David (p. 64), and his followers

⁴ So already Graetz (*Gesch.*, V, fourth ed., p. 277; comp. Eppenstein's remark *ad loc.*), who, however, by an error calls Jacob b. Natronai the predecessor of Yom-Tob b. Jacob.

Joseph b. Zaddik and Saadya ibn Danān have turned into Joseph b. Judah. It is therefore not impossible that עמרם בר שלמה had arisen in some unknown manner from עמרם בר ששנא, owing to a misconception of the abbreviation ב"ש. Nor is the existence of Hai b. Kiyumi substantiated elsewhere, for the passage from אר"י, I, 197a, adduced by Ginzberg, p. 68: בשם רב פ' ורב סעדיה נאון רב סעדיה נאון פ' may as well have reference to Hai b. David or Hai b. Nahshon, since indeed בשם פ' does not necessarily mean oral transmission; but it is more probable that the reading should be ורב היי נאון פ' בשם רב סעדיה נאון, for Tosafot Giṭṭin, beginning, mention this explanation as coming from Hai and Saadya (ור"י (שמע בשם רב האי נאון ובשם רבי' סעדיה), and this points to the probability that in the original source Hai was placed before Saadya (Mordecai Giṭṭin, beginning, has only ורב סעדיה פירש, comp. also Yeroḥam's אדם וחוה, XXIV, 2). Nor can we say with Ginzberg that Hai b. Kiyumi was not mentioned by Sherira because he was not Gaon officially, since Nathan states expressly (p. 80, l. 6) ומלך אחריו. This Hai is only mentioned in the Kabbalistic traditional chain of Eleazar of Worms (*Monatsschrift*, XLIX, 697), but probably here too Nathan served as source.

While the rehabilitation of Nathan may be said to have been unsuccessful in this respect, Ginzberg rightly refutes the perverse view of Halevy that Nathan's data concerning the superiority of Sura over Pumbedita had reference to Talmudic and not Gaonic times. Ginzberg was in a position even to corroborate (p. 47) Nathan's statement that the Gaon of Sura withheld the title Gaon from his equal in Pumbedita in his correspondence with the latter, through a Responsum of Jacob b. Mordecai to Joseph b. Shela which is found in several sources and which contains the following: וכתיב הכא לבי דינא דמר רב יוסף ריש מתיבתא בריה דמרנא ורבנא שילה (comp. also Lewin, *Jahrbuch d. jüd.-lit. Gesellsch.*, VIII, 328). Nathan, however, says only that the presidents of the Academy at Pumbedita were not accorded the title Gaon by those of Sura, but he does not say that the former did not bear that title at all. Therefore I must differ from Ginzberg's view that the scholastic heads in Pumbedita bore originally only the title אלוף (identical with ראש כלה) and that only Sherira designated them as Geonim as a token of reverence to his

predecessors. Consequently Samuel **ראש כלה**, Aḥa's teacher, is hardly identical with the Gaon Samuel b. Mar of Pumbedita, for, if this were so, Hai and his followers, Abraham b. Isaac and Solomon b. Adret (see my **ענינים שונים**, I, 65), would have certainly called him Gaon. As little identical is Huna Alluf with Huna b. Joseph (see *ib.*, 54) and still less so Judah Alluf **דמנהר פקור** with Jehudai, the pre-predecessor of Samuel b. Mar (and not follower, as Ginzberg, p. 50, puts it by mistake), for **דמנהר פקור** proves that he came from **נהר פקור** and was **ראש כלה** in Basra,⁵ a city that stood in frequent relations with the Geonim (see e. g. vol. II, 33. 212). The title Alluf, however, was mostly granted to foreign scholars (see my **ענינים שונים**, p. 67). Nor is it true that in the Halakot Gedolot the heads of the Academy in Pumbedita are termed Allufim only and never Geonim (which would indeed be natural in a work of Suran origin), for we find e. g. ed. Hildesheimer, p. 185. 842: **ושדר רב פלמוי בר אבוי נאון**.

As for details in this part of the book the following is to be remarked: p. 1 the calendar was completed not in Palestine but, as most modern research shows, in Babylonia; see my art. *Calendar (Jewish)* in Hastings' *Encycl. of Religions*, III, 118.—p. 2, n. 1 Against a Jewish apostolate comp. Pines in the *Carlebach-Festschrift*, p. 187 ff.—p. 8 Hai was no ראש כלה and the passage in *Saadyana*, p. 118, proves nothing. As to the words ודלא כתב ליה, לכם דלא רישא אלא ריש כלא דהוא ליה, I must adhere to my explanation (עניינים, I, 61) in opposition to Ginzberg and Marx who follows him (*ZfñB.*, XIII, 173). Comp. also Aptowitzer, *Monatsschrift*, LV, 634 below.—p. 11, n. 2 To the passages here mentioned add *Sifre*, Deut., § 162 and *Sifre Zuṭa* quoted *Monatsschrift*, LV, 707.—p. 12 Not Amram, Sherira's uncle, but his father Meshwi was ראש כלה, see Sherira, ed. Neub., p. 41 and my עניינים, I, 59.—p. 13 Concerning רב נתן אב הישיבה comp. *ib.*, 61, and as to Israel, the supposed son of Samuel b. Ḥofni, see *REJ.*, LXII, 120, In *Med. Jew. Chr.* I, 189 (so, not 198) Samuel cannot

⁵ This Jehudai is also quoted in *Eshkol*, II, 67 (comp. Brüll's *Jahrbücher*, V, 158): ר' יהודאי ריש כלה דמנחר פקוד מבצרה כהן קורא ג' מסוקים לוי: *ענינים שונים*, I, 56. *ג' פ' וישראל ג' פ' ואל ירלנו וכו'*, which is to be added in my

be emended into Israel, for the year of decease 1345 Sel. (= 1034) is that of Samuel; rather should שמואל הכהן בן ארננו be obliterated in the line before the last, so that Hofni's year of decease 1324 Sel. (= 1013) would be obtained, see *REJ.*, LXIII, 318. —p. 16 Sherira indeed says expressly that the vacancy at Sura occurred not before Moses b. Jacob but after his decease: ובתריה מר רב משה כהנא ... ועמדו שתי שנים בלא נאון. —p. 41 Concerning בית רבינו שבבבל see also *ZfhB.*, XIII, 10.—p. 51, note. The expression בשביל is not peculiar to Natronai alone, see *Pardes*, 5b (No. 289) ... בשביל כך אמר מר רב יהודאי נאון בשביל (comp. on this point *REJ.*, LVII, 245), also vol. II, 231, l. 8: בשביל דינרא דרהבא, a Responsum which Ginzberg himself (p. 229) ascribes to Hai. Also the Responsum ed. Harkavy (הגרין, IV, 73): ובשביל בישולי גוים probably does not come from Natronai (see further below),—*ib.*, n. 2 Regarding the Responsa of the Geonim to Kairwan comp. my אנשי קירואן, p. 5 ff., where Hilai b. Mari (792-801) is suggested as the first Gaon who came in contact with that city. That also Saadya sent Responsa to Kairwan directly is perhaps to be concluded from Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, IV, 93, l. 7.

The second part of the first volume deals, as already mentioned, with the halakic literature of the Geonim, for, as Ginzberg amplifies, the Halakah in its threefold manifestation: Talmudic exegesis, Codification, and Liturgy, was the exclusive domain of the Geonim. Saadya busied himself also with other subjects, not because of but in spite of being Gaon. Still also the earlier Geonim dealt with at least two more subjects, with Midrash and Mysticism. Thus it is said of the Midrash *Esfah* in the well-known passage in *Yalkuṭ*, I, 736 (quoted by Ginzberg, p. 104 note): ולמד אותם בתרביץ: מוצא (מרנא. r.) ורבנא חנינאי כהן ראש ישיבה נאון. As to the mystic writings it is not proved that they had Geonim as authors, and Hai even rejects their authority in his well-known Responsum in טעם וקנים; the earlier Geonim, however, indulged in these things by all means (see Weiss, IV, 49). However that may be, the chief merit of the Geonim lies in the fact that they codified the Talmud and considered its interpretation eminently as their task.

The oldest work of the Gaonic time is the *She'eltot* by Aḥa of Shabḥa, who, though an offshoot from the school of the Geonim,

was not endowed himself with the title Gaon and hence emigrated to Palestine. Ginzberg devotes to this work a whole chapter (p. 75-95), proving against Halevy that the She'eltot came into existence not before Aḥa's emigration to Palestine but rather when he was already in that land, which is substantiated also by some linguistic peculiarities, as **היירא**, **לא לפא**, etc. (p. 87). Still the Babylonian derivation of the author is borne out by some characteristic features, and ingenious is the remark that the theme on the study of the Torah was incorporated in the She'elta to **לך לך** because this was the so-called "Reception-Sabbath" (**שבֿתא דרינלא**) in Babylonia. Despite the assertion that the She'eltot originated in Palestine Ginzberg maintains that Aḥa made no use of the Palestinian Talmud and that all passages to this effect, which came into the She'eltot and which are mostly registered in the commentary **העמק שאלה** of N. Z. J. Berlin, prove nothing. Yet I believe that some passages, which I have reduced to seven (**ענינים**, I, 16), remain in their force and cannot be disproved. Thus the passage in She'elta **XX ויצא** **ואי לנטורי דאגרא אשלימו** **XX ויצא** (with me No. 2) is after all influenced by p. B. k. 3, the one in **יתרו** LI (with me No. 7) by p. Ber. 6, 1 (comp. now also Aptowitz, *REJ.*, LXIII, 126), and so on. Furthermore, Abraham b. Isaac in *Eshkol*, I, 117 (quoted also by Ginzberg, p. 85) cites expressly the Palestinian Talmud as source for She'elta **XCVI** (with me No. 12): **אמרי דרב איקלע לבי שמואל שדר ליה שמואל**: **אמרי דרב איקלע לבי שמואל שדר ליה שמואל**, and in **העמק שאלה** p. Ber. 2 (fol. 5b, l. 25) is rightly pointed out: **תני כלה אסורה לביתה כל**: **שבעה ואסור ליטול ממנה כוס של ברכה דברי ר"א וכו'**. Nor is there any reason why the source for She'elta I on Sabbath garments (with Ginzberg, p. 80; with me, No. 1) should not be p. Peah 8, 8 but the late *Pesikta rabbeti*, since the latter probably drew upon the Palestinian Talmud.—New light is thrown upon the composition of the She'eltot through the Genizah fragments which are published in vol. II and which will be mentioned later. Among these are also found entirely new She'eltot, a perusal of which reveals the original ingredients in following order: (1) **שאלתא** (2) **ברם** (3) **בריד** (4) **לענין** and (5) **דרשא** (sometimes, however, 5 stood before 4, see p. 91, n. 2) and also the fact that the **דרשא** simply contained extracts from the Babylonian Talmud, which were in

course of time dropped by the copyists, leading to the ultimate obliteration of the superscription itself. Ginzberg believes thus that the main purpose of Aḥa was to introduce and propagate the Babylonian Talmud in Palestine.

The first author among the Geonim was Jehudai, whose high value is illustrated through a very interesting Genizah fragment which is published in vol. II, 52-53 (comp. also the Responsum, ed. Harkavy, in *הנרן*, IV, 72 by a pupil of ראבה who in turn was Jehudai's pupil). Ginzberg finds the reason for this high esteem in the fact that with Jehudai begins a new era, an era of literary activity. An allusion to it is found in Hai's words cited by Judah b. Barzillai (*ספר השמרות*, p. 126): דבר זה כתבוהו ראשונים אחד אחד: (comp. also *REJ.*, XLVII, 142). However, Jehudai seems to have been besides that a charming personality, which accounts for his great fame and high reputation. Ginzberg devotes to him and the Halakot Gedolot a minute study (p. 95-117), arriving at the following conclusion: The current Hal. Ged. or ה"ג I are Jehudai's creation, which, like all similar productions, was subject to subsequent changes and additions. Thus the pupils added many of their teacher's Responsa and many She'eltot passages. The work was recast and remodeled completely about 900 through Simon Kayyara, and a specimen of this revision is found in the Vatican manuscript (ה"ג II). Simon's work was called originally שמעון ר' שחקן גדולות שחקן ר', but the last three words were very soon forgotten. Ginzberg bases his argument chiefly on the fragment published by him in vol. II, 85, from which it is evident that already earlier Geonim credited Jehudai with the Hal. Ged., since we read here that the doubtful passage was added by Jacob b. Mordecai, a pupil of Jehudai ... ומפ' בהל' גר' דכל היכא דקנו לה שביתה בספינה מחולא שפיר דאמי למיתב בה בשבתא ... הכין חזי' דהא מילתא דאשכחחון בהל' לא (סבירא לנא דמעיקרא משמא דמר יעקב בר מרדכי נע איתמרא וכו'). But the title הלכות גדולות has sense only if other הלכות already existed (analogous to סדר עולם, which was afterwards called סדר עולם רבא in contrast to ס"ע זוטא; that Jehudai derived the title from the Talmud Shebuot 45a, as Ginzberg would have it, p. 107, n. 2, is

improbable); as a matter of fact nobody knows this title before Sherira (see Epstein, *הגנן*, III, 54). It is therefore probable that in the above fragment, in the first (but not the second) place, the word *גנר* is an addition by the hand of a copyist, to whom also the formula *נ"ע* after the name Jacob is to be ascribed, since this formula came into use only in late Gaonic times.⁶ Besides, if Ginzberg's theory holds true, the Geonim who lived after 900, in citing the Hal. Ged., should have always indicated which of the two they meant, but this is not always the case (comp. e. g. *תשובות גנ"ק*, No. 152, end); to assume, however, that the words *שתקן ר' שמעון* have been dropped everywhere is improbable.—Ginzberg reviews also (p. 116) the *הלכות ראו* edited by Schlossberg and the *הלכות קצובות* edited by Horovitz, stating that the former simply represent an abbreviated Hebrew translation of parts of the Hal. Ged. It escaped him, however, that ed. Schlossberg came from an Aramaic original, nor did he observe that he himself published in vol. II, 382-393 a large fragment of this original, regarding which see my article in *REJ.*, LXVIII, 232-244 (see also *ZfhB.*, XV, 18-6, and further below).

The following are minor remarks in connection with this chapter: p. 96, n. 2 That the Responsa edited by Harkavy in *הגנן*, IV, 71 ff., cannot come from Hilai I have shown already in *ZfhB.*, VII, 130, using the same reasons as Ginzberg; and as to the *ראבה* mentioned there see Aptowitz, *REJ.*, LXII, 245 ff.—p. 111, n. 2. The influence of Jehudai's anti-Karaite tendencies makes itself felt also in the Responsa just mentioned, whose author was, as already stated, a disciple of Jehudai's pupil, comp. e. g. p. 72: *ואין חזיר אלא מי שלמד תורה שבכתב וכפר בתורה שבעל פה*. This is at the same time to my knowledge the only pre-Saadyanic anti-Karaite Gaonic Responsum (comp. *JQR.*, X, 239; but then this Responsum was not yet known).—p. 117, n. 1 *אקלמון מתא* was emended already long

⁶ It occurs written in full in a Worms inscription from the year 1091 (Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, 404; comp. Harkavy, *Altjüdische Denkmäler aus d. Krim* p. 138), probably because it was yet little known. Furthermore, it occurs in Donnolo (ed. Castelli, p. 3) alongside with *ז"ל*, but here as well as in Saadya's and Hai's Responsa cited by Zunz (l. c., 341; still to be added is e. g. *Stud. u. Mitt.* IV, 92) we never have the certainty as to whether it was not an interpolation by the copyist or Hebrew translator of the Responsa. At any rate, the phrase is not known before Saadya.

ago into קירואן מתא (see my אנשי קירואן, p. 8), but now I should not consider this emendation as certain.

After a short chapter on "Codification not Favoured" (p. 117-119) follows one on the Siddur of Amram Gaon (p. 119-154), which is the most instructive and suggestive in the whole volume. With profuse erudition it is shown that the liturgical part of this Siddur which has come down to us constitutes only a minimum of its original form. The text was changed in every land to fit the ritual in vogue there. The halakic part of the Siddur was preserved in a relatively better state, but even this underwent all kinds of changes and interpolations; thus, apart from subsequent additions, Responsa of Amram were incorporated at different points. All this is corroborated by numerous examples, to quote which would lead us too far astray. I only want to call attention to the various digressions, above all to the Yozer-Ḳedushah (p. 130 ff.). Once more the need for a critical edition of this Siddur is shown, and material for such an edition is being furnished by Marx in his *Untersuchungen* (vol. I, 1908; on which see my review *ZfHb.*, XIII, 9).⁷

As to details in this chapter the following may be added; p. 127 with regard to the insertion of the שירת הים in the morning prayer comp. also Büchler, *OLZ.*, XIV, 372.—p. 141, n. 2 The expression מתיבתא הקדושה seems to occur always only in connection with the Academy of Pumbedita; a Maḥzor in manuscript at Hamburg (see Jellinek's קונטרס תר"י, No. 4) contains: אזהרות ראש מתיבתא קדישא דרבנים דפומבדיתא. — p. 148 That the title ראש ישיבת נאון יעקב was peculiar only to the heads of the Academy at Sura and ראש ישיבה של גולה to those at Pumbedita remains without proof. Thus Aaron ibn Sarjado styles himself ראש ישיבת נאון יעקב (see *המדרה ננוה*, No. 37), while Hai, for instance, bears both titles (Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, IV, 88, 90, 215; in accordance with this my conclusions in *REJ.*, LI, 55 are to be corrected; comp. also Marx *JQR.*, N. S., I, 71). That in Maimonides' days the title ראש ישיבת נאון יעקב was current in Palestine is due perhaps to the fact that the scholastic presidents in that land bore this title likewise in the eleventh century and even carried it with

⁷ Equally useless is the latest edition of Amram's Siddur by Frumkin in two volumes (Jerusalem 1912), for its mere outward form is confusing.

them to Egypt later on, see *REJ.*, *l.c.*, 52. However, it was also current in Babylonia; thus it was borne by Maimonides' antagonist, Samuel b. Ali, see Benjamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, 60: הרב ר' שמואל: בן עלי ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב (Pethahya, ed. Gruenhut, p. 8 has only ראש ישיבה⁸.—p. 149 Nathan Alluf, see above.—p. 150, n. 2 Concerning אשכנז in the Gaonic literature see in addition *ZfhB.*, XV, 76, where the passage from נט"מ, 149 is to be added.

From Amram to Saadya there is no eminent halakic author among the Geonim, although some of the intervening Geonim are credited, justly or unjustly, with various productions (p. 154-162). Thus Nahshon still poses as the author of the book ראומה, although the title-page of this very rare work bears הנה"ה i. e. 5560 (1300) as the year of composition (comp. also *ZfhB.*, XV, 179). On the other hand he is rightly considered as the author of the *Iggul* which is named after him. It is only remarkable that Abraham Ibn Ezra who mentions it first (hence long before Eliezer b. Jacob Belin), although not by name, in the beginning of his שלש שאלות (ed. Steinschneider in *שני המאורות*), does not indicate the name of the author: השאלה הראשונה על דברי הלוחות אשר גבלו ראשונים, איש על שמו מתוקנים, שהם בניימין על רמ"ז שנים וכו'.—A talmudic lexicon it attributed to Zemah b. Paltoi, but the only author who possessed it and quotes it is the relatively late Abraham Zacuto; Ginzberg believes therefore (p. 159) that perhaps some other Zemah was the author of the lexicon and Zacuto mistook him for his namesake the Gaon. But if so he would not have called him with the patronymic בר פלטי. Moreover, the citations preserved from the lexicon make the impression of an old product, and a non-Gaon Zemah is not known from those early days. In favor of Gaonic descent is also the circumstance that המספר קומי found its place under the letter ה (see Kohut,

⁸ The title was then abbreviated through ignorance to גאון יעקב; thus; e. g., Benjamin, ed. Asher, 77, says of David al-Roy: ולמד... לפני ראש. הישיבה עלי גאון יעקב. That this is not to be emended into לפני עלי ראש, as Kaufmann (*REJ.*, XVII, 304) would have it, it proved by the fact that we find similar titles also in the Diwan of Eleazar b. Jacob ha-Babli (*JQR.*, XI, 683).

p. XVII), an analogous procedure being found also in Saadya, who in his biblical lexicon recorded הביתן likewise under ה (see *Monatsschrift*, XLVI, 366).

As in all other branches of literature Saadya was epoch-making also in Halakah, being the first to compose halakic compendia (p. 162-165). However, Saadya, strictly speaking, belonged to the Geonim but not to the Gaonic school, since he was an outsider. That he had also written commentaries to the Talmud may now safely be assumed; on the other hand the glosses to Berakot, ed. Wertheimer, can hardly be attributed to him, the opening words ללפיומי נאון referring only to the first explanation (comp. also *REJ.*, LVIII, 150, and *Monatsschrift*, LII, 304; LV, 65, n. 4; more in another connection). Deserving attention is also Hai's commentary on Toharot, p. 38: כל שאין לו כתף ולא נטף ... זה בתוספה מסכת פיאה בפרק המקבל שדה ולקמן פירש רב, סעדיה פירוש כתף ונטף, from which we may perhaps infer the existence of a commentary by Saadya on this tractate. On the contrary, by Saadya's commentaries (אדוננו מר רב סעדיה) מצינו בפירושי (כי רבינו סעדיה ז"ל) (comp. also *Stud. u. Mitt.*, IV, 30) or commentary (נאון נ"ע, *Lyck*, No. 1) his commentaries to the Bible are meant. Some halakic writings of Saadya pursue an anti-Karaite tendency, thus probably his commentary on the thirteen rules of R. Ishmael (see *REJ.*, XLVII, 136). Of the ספר הפקדון Friedlaender thought not long ago that he had found an Arabic fragment, which he edited together with a Hebrew translation (*Lewy-Festschrift*, p. 62-75), but it belongs to a later work (see *Monatsschrift*, LV, 501; comp. also Eppenstein, *ib.*, p. 66 ff.).

The three great followers of Saadya: Sherira, Hai, and Samuel b. Hofni, all stood, according to Ginzberg, under the influence of their predecessor (p. 167-176), and the opinion is ventured that Sherira's Epistle is unthinkable without Saadya, which seems to me to be without foundation. As to Sherira's Talmud commentaries, which Isaac of Vienna cites as נמוקי רב שרירא, comp. in addition *ZfthB.*, XV, 170, and *REJ.*, LXIV, 210. Hai's commentary on Berakot is expressly quoted also in Nissim's *Mafteah* (ed. Goldenthal, p. 23a above, see further below), in the ספר העתים, p. 34, in the חרשי מהר"ם חלאוה to Pesahim (see Marx, *ZfthB.*, XIII, 174), and in

כשם שמפרש) תוספות שאנן to Baba ḵamma 2a from שטה מקובצת רבינו האי גאון ז"ל בברכות פרק הרואה גבי ארבעה צריכין להורות (שאינם כסדר המקרא וכו' comp. Gross, *REJ.*, VII, 70 and see further below); his commentary on Shabbat likewise in Nissim's *Mafteah* to Shab. 12 (p. 28b: ואלו דבריו (וכו'), and by Jonah Ibn Janah in his dictionary, s. v. מור (ed. Neubauer, p. 368, l. 15: (וקאל רבינו האיי פי תפסירה לשבת s. v. and in the (וכדלך פסר פיה רבינו האיי פי תפסיר שבת: 420, 5) ענר ונשאל לרה"ג ז"ל ולא יקרא לאור הנר אמר רבה (p. 222, ספר העתים ואפי' גבוה שתי קומות ומצאנו בפירושי אדונינו נטריה רחמנא דהלכה ואפי' נטריה רחמנא דהלכה comp. Resp. Lyck, No. 59); his commentary on Ḥagigah is probably mentioned in a book-list from the Genizah (comp. *JQR.*, XIII, 329, No. 77) and is quoted in Joseph b. Eliezer's אהל יוסף (הגאונים הוא) sect. שמות, No. 11 = צפנת פענח, ed. Herzog, p. 193 רבינו האיי גאון ז"ל אשר אמר בפ' מסכת חגיגה שלו דעו כי דברי אנדה comp. לא בשמועה הם גם בשאלות ותשובות שלו פירשו כמו זה comp. *Monatsschrift*, XXXIV, 187) and in Reḵanati's טעמי המצות, ed. Basel, 21b (וכן הבנתי דברים אלו מפי רבינו האיי גאון ז"ל בפירוש מסכת) which removes all doubt. Besides this Ibn Janah cites also, s. v. את, Hai's commentary to Beṣah (p. 77, 22: ווגדת פי פירושים לר' האיי ז"ל פי' קול אלמשינה בש"א יחפור בדקר ויכסה וזה הפי' שפירשנו to fol. 22: חדושי הרמב"ן) and perhaps Hai wrote a commentary also on Baba batra, see חדושי הרמב"ן. The authenticity of the commentary on Toharot still remains an open question (comp. also my אנשי קירואן, p. 47). To the halakic monographs coming from Hai are also to be added הלכות שמיטה (see my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litteratur*, p. 52) or, what is more probable, ה' שחיטה (see Harkavy in *אוצר ישראל*, IV, 96b). Hai enjoyed also a philosophical education, since he cites, for instance, in his *Hāwi* the *Ḥarishim* גם ישנים, VII, 5), by al-Farābī (see Harkavy, and perhaps he also composed a commentary on the Pentateuch (see *ib.*, p. 6). As halakist Hai must have towered above all his predecessors, including Saadya. More similarity with Saadya has his Suran successor, Samuel b. Ḥofni, a fragment of whose Arabic introduction is now accessible in print (ed. Cowley, in *Harkavy-Festschrift*, p. 162-163). It is surprising that Ginzberg ignored

Aaron ibn Sarjado completely, of whom indeed a talmudic commentary on Yebamot is quoted in vol. II, 67.

Of anonymous halakic writings which, according to Ginzberg, still belong to the Gaonic period he discusses the following successively: The סדר תנאים ואמוראים on which comp. now Marx in *Lewy-Festschrift* (p. 392-399).—The ספר המקצעות and ספר חפץ he considers likewise as offsprings of the Gaonic period and suggests that they had been composed at Kairwan. But how does it happen that these two works were only known in Germany, beginning with Eliezer b. Nathan (see my אנשי קירואן, p. 22. 27), while the other scholars of Kairwan, as, for instance, Nissim and Ḥananel, were known and in vogue also in Spain and Italy? It is to be remarked here that Ḥefeṣ b. Yaṣliḥ did not correspond with Hai, since the Responsum in תמים דעים, No. 119 was addressed to Bahlūl at Kairwan (see *ib.*, p. 14; the reading רב בחלול instead of הלל רבינו is now confirmed through דרשת הרמב"ן לר"ה, ed. Schwarz, p. 23).—The בשר ע"ג נחלים is certainly post-Gaonic and composed in Europe, see hereon J. N. Epstein in *Jahrb. d. jüd.-lit. Ges.*, VIII, 447 and *ZfhB.*, XV, 174. Also the ספר מתיבות is undoubtedly post-Gaonic; as the place of its origin Marx suggests Palestine (*JQR.*, N. S. I, 86 ff.).—As to שמושא רבא see now Aptowitzer, *REJ.*, LVII, 252 and Marx, *ZfhB.*, XIII, 172.

At the very end of the volume (p. 182-205) Ginzberg discusses the Gaonic Responsa and their importance, criticising at the same time the procedure of Müller, who had grouped them according to the individual Geonim, since tradition in this respect is uncertain and the similarity of names of many Geonim makes it often impossible to indicate the authorship. The first attempt to collect the Responsa was made, according to Ginzberg, in Kairwan; we find, however, that not only the interrogators in their queries to Sherira and Hai (not only to Hai, as Ginzberg puts it p. 182, see רב שרירא גאון ... וששאלתם בנדר של פשתן. No. 73: ... הלכות פסוקות (לפי שמצינו בתשובות שאלות ... ילמדנו אדונינו היאך מנהג בשיבה וכו' give reference to Responsa collections, but even these Geonim themselves do it; see vol. II, 231, l. 8. 11: ויש תשובתה מפורשת בשאלות: (one more proof that the Responsa referred to come from Hai). There was no fixed rule for the collection, and in the collections

instituted outside of the Academy also non-Gaonic Responsa were admitted. The latter, according to Ginzberg, only by those who were contemporaries of Hai, among whom Alfasi was the youngest, being twenty-five years of age at the death of Hai. However, Ginzberg himself offers a collection of Responsa in vol. II, 36, where Nathan b. Jehiel is quoted as already deceased, hence from the first half of the twelfth century. On the other hand, the Responsa in קהלת שלמה, No. 56b (p. 52-62. 83-89) and in הקדם II, 87, No. 8, where Hai is quoted as already deceased, might have been composed by his younger contemporaries. Unjust is also the claim that only halakic Responsa have been preserved. We possess indeed from Hai a very elaborate theologico-philosophical Responsum upon the problem of the 'Ajal (אָל), which was adopted by Judah ibn Ba'lam in his commentary on Isa. 38 and which is now accessible to us completely in the original (קהלת שלמה, No. 3, comp. in the same connection my remarks *Monatsschrift*, XLIV, 142). Moreover, the chronological problems found in the list of the Responsa *ib.*, p. 69 have hardly anything in common with similar problems by Ḥiwi Albalkhi, as Ginzberg maintains (p. 201, n. 2). They were rather modeled after similar questions in the talmudic-midrashic literature. Besides, among Ḥiwi's queries that have been preserved there is not even one of a chronological content, for the question of such a nature found at the end of Saadya's *Emunot*, section III, does not belong to him (see my חייו הבלבי, p. 19).⁹ Very useful are the lists on p. 187-199 of Gaonic quotations in the works of three schools: the Spanish (the writings of Judah b. Barzilai), the Italian (שבלי הלקט), and the French (מחזור ויטרי) with an index of the places where they occur. Here the great erudition of Ginzberg manifests itself, and such lists are desirable also for other works, particularly for those of the German school (above all אור זרוע).

The volume closes with observations concerning the importance of the Gaonic Responsa also as monuments of literature and history in which the spirit of their age is reflected (p. 202-203). Although

⁹ A relation could rather be found between Ḥiwi's questions and a series of contradictions between biblical verses, such as are enumerated, for instance, in *Sifre*, Numb., § 42 (ed. Friedmann, fol. 13a). On this comp. now Bacher, *REJ.*, LXIII, 153.

sometimes inviting contradiction this volume contains so many instructive elements and reveals so many new aspects that it will continue to be of lasting value.

II

These new aspects, to which I have referred as being abundant in the first volume, Ginzberg was able to obtain mostly from the treasures of the Genizah, which he edited in vol. II and which contain such a plethora of material that even to sketch it approximately would require more than the frame of even an elaborate review. Altogether 47 larger or smaller fragments are edited here, of which the first 38 (with the exception of No. VI. VII. X. XXXIV. XXXV) contain Gaonic Responsa (p. 1-345), while the last 9, which form an appendix (p. 347-401), contain very important pieces from Gaonic works, as She'eltot, Halakot Gedolot, etc. The first 18 fragments (p. 1-165), it is true, were published prior to this in *JQR.*, XVI-XX, but they were very scattered here (see the concordance table by Marx, *ZfjhB.*, XIII, 165), and hence it is fit and proper that Ginzberg has published them in vol. II once more.

All these fragments come, as mentioned above, from the Genizah: 35 of them (No. III, IV, VI, VII, XIII-XXXIV and XXXIX-XLVII) from the Taylor-Schechter Collection, 9 (No. VIII-XII and XXXV-XXXVIII) from the Bodleiana, 2 (No. I-II) from the British Museum, and one (No. V) from the private collection of D. W. Amram in Philadelphia. Ginzberg maintains that he has incorporated in his work all the Gaonic Responsa found in the above-named libraries. An exception are the Responsa written in Arabic (a Responsum by Hai not included, which he offers on p. 38 together with a Hebrew translation), which, however, is to be regretted very much. Besides, he also omitted the Responsa already known taking them up only when they offered variants. These variants are very instructive, and Ginzberg calls attention to them chiefly in his learned prefaces to each fragment. Since we have fragments before us it is natural that a great part of the Responsa contained in them should be imperfect and also that the authors should be indicated only in very rare cases, and here again Ginzberg has proved his great

erudition in the above-mentioned prefaces, succeeding often in his attempt to obtain the names of these authors. Besides, these prefaces contain a brief summary of the contents of each fragment and other remarks. The number of the Responsa offered here, both complete and fragmentary, amounts to more than 300, and of all the collections known heretofore only the one by Harkavy equals it in value, the difference being that ours, with the exception of very few fragments, has not preserved everywhere as Harkavy's the very interesting introductory and concluding formulae. Rare examples are the introductory formula in *Fragm. XVIII* (p. 214), the concluding formula in *Fragm. XXXVI* (p. 283), and especially the introductory formula in *Fragm. XXXVIII B* (p. 326), where not only the date (Adar 1169 Sel. = 858), the author (Amram b. Sheshna), and the person addressed (Meir b. Joseph) are recorded, but also the subject taught at the academy during that Kallah-month (אתיאן באדר דשנת קס"ט בר איתני הנחל עצים ובא לו כהן). Here is also found the introductory formula beginning with שאו שלום, which is known also from other sources and which resembles most closely the one found at the beginning of Amram's Siddur (see my ענינים שונים, I, 46 ff., where ours is now to be added).

Especially interesting are the following fragments: *Fr. VI* (p. 50-53) which comes from a Palestinian who was a pupil or younger contemporary of Jehudai and which sheds much light on the dominating influence of the Babylonians in Jerusalem. The following passage is especially to be emphasized (p. 52): עד עכשיו אין אומרים בארץ ישראל קדוש ושמע אלא בשבת או בימים טובים בלבד חוץ מירושלים ובכל מדינה שיש בה בבליין שעשו מריבה ומחלוקת עד שקיבלו עליהם לומר קדושה בכל יום אבל בשאר מדינות ועירות שבארץ ישראל שאין בהן בבליין אין אומרים קדוש אלא בשבת וימים טובים בלבד (on the subject comp. Ginzberg's introductory remarks to this fragment). Here is also found the above-mentioned high estimation of Jehudai, which has an analogy in the *Responsum*, ed. Harkavy (הגנן, IV, 72).—*Fr. VII* (p. 56-71) contains indices to Gaonic Responsa, such as have been known heretofore only from Wertheimer's קהלת שלמה. Here, however, we learn to know quite new names and entirely new facts, thus, for instance, that Meshullam b. Kalonymus of Lucca was in correspondence with Sherira and Hai (p. 57; comp. my ענינים שונים, I, 64), that

Aaron ibn Sarjado had written talmudic commentaries (p. 67: מצינו בפירוש מרב אהרן, see above), that there was in Pumbedita a residence for the scholastic president of Sura (p. 71: שאלות לרבנו; הא"י זל... תלמודה גלסו פי דאר ראם מתיבה סורא ותנו מעה אלך; the passage is not altogether clear, see *ZfhB.*, XV, 169), etc., etc.—Fr. X (p. 87-88) which contains no Responsum but an epistle. The writer was of Bagdad and contemporary of the sons of R. Natira and the sons of R. Aaron (Aaron ibn Sarjado?) and he wrote in the interest of the Academy (see p. 88, l. 15: כי אם אין צבא אין: מלך ובאפס תלמידים אין הור לחכמים), but which?—Fr. XIII (p. 114-121) which contains among other things the סדר מאה ברכות mentioned by Amram at the beginning of his Siddur and sent by Natronai b. Hilai to Lucena (see the learned introductory remarks of the author).—Fr. XXVII (p. 239-241) which contains partly Responsa and partly Decisions, but in a quite peculiar form, as with the superscription קושיא (p. 239, l. 23, 31), פירוש (p. 240, l. 5, 6, 8; l. 11: לבעץ אלגאונים does not mean "some of Geonim" but a certain Gaon), etc.—Fr. XXVIII (p. 246-249) which contains a kind of commentary on Baba ḥamma 51a-82a, but in the form of answers to questions (comp. e. g. p. 247, l. 29: וששאלתם, p. 249, l. 23: לא כמו ששאלתם). Such Responsa-like talmudic commentaries have their analogy in other Gaonic Responsa collections, and to those mentioned by Ginzberg, p. 242 are still to be added above all the word explanations to Abodah Zarah which Hai sent in the year 993 to Elḥanan b. Shemariah and which are known even as שרח אלפאט עבודה זרה (Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, IV, 22-24; comp. *ib.*, p. 350). Such commentaries are of inestimable value for the exegesis and textual criticism of the Talmud.—Fr. XXXIV (p. 275-276) which consists of two leaves, of which 1 *recto* is blank, while 1 *verso* contains only a few lines beginning with

the words: בשמך רחמ' פירוש פרק הרואה לר' נסים זקל and then giving an explanation to ארבעה צריכינ להורות (Berakot 54b), the same as quoted by the 'Aruk, s. v. ארבע, from a Responsum by Hai and by the שמה מקובצת, as seen above, from the תוספות שאנץ as coming from Hai's commentary on Berakot. Between leaf 1 and 2 there is a lacuna, and leaf 2 contains the interpretation of a passage in Berakot 59b-60a. Ginzberg believes that here we

have a fragment of Nissim's ספר המפתח which was omitted in the edition (where there is altogether no explanation to Berakot 54 nor to 59-62). It is, however, difficult to believe that Nissim, who cites Hai otherwise (comp. e. g. ed. Goldenthal, fol. 13a and 15a) and even quotes expressly his commentary on Berakot (fol. 23a above: ואדונינו האיי נאון ז"ל כתב בפירושו דברכות הכי) should not name here the originator. Besides, even if we should admit with Ginzberg that the Hebrew translator had omitted the Hebrew Gaonic Responsa which are quoted in the *Mafteah*, why did he omit also the explanation to 59b-60a? The latter is also much more elaborate than the others in the *Mafteah*, containing the phrase והכין חזינא (p. 275, l. 10) which is current only among the Geonim. It is perhaps not venturesome to assume that the copyist had erred and that we have before us a fragment of Hai's commentary on Berakot, which, as may be seen from the quotations in Solomon b. Adret's *novellae* to this tractate, was quite elaborate.

Of especial interest are also: Fragm. XXXV (p. 278-279) which contains a rhymed epistle by Hai to Judah b. Joseph of Kairwan and concerning which see *ZfḥB.*, XIV, 23. 82. 84. 115, and the Fragm. XXXVIII (p. 318-345) already mentioned which is the most comprehensive. It consists of two parts: A. MS. Bodl. 2760, fol. 11-12, and 2826, fol. 62-63, contains fifty explanations to passages in Shabbat 3a-57a (with a lacuna to 8b-17b) from an older Gaon (perhaps Natronai). The explanations are brief, mostly of a linguistic character, and, as Ginzberg points out, were used assiduously by the 'Aruk. Emphasis must especially be given to the explanations to בר פחתי (p. 318, l. 9), מנלת סתרים (p. 319, l. 7, on which comp. Ginzberg's remark p. 295), עססיות (p. 320, l. 4), חותלות (*ib.*, l. 18; comp. *REJ.*, LXI, 206 ff.), צלוליבא (p. 321, l. 14), תרמדאי (*ib.*, l. 18), תלא אילן (p. 322, l. 9: בריה), קטנה היא ... ושמענו שמצוי באיספמא heard from Eleazar Alluf, which would be a further proof for Natronai's authorship, see my ענינים שונים, I, 52), etc. They all have in addition some bearing on the history of civilization.—B. MS. Bodl. 2826, fol. 64-73, contains 51 Responsa by Amram mostly on ציצית, which, as Ginzberg points out, were present before the *Ittur* as a collection and which exhibit many interesting points. Thus

Resp. II (p. 328, l. 9.—p. 330, l. 14) on Tosefta, Sifra, and Sifre, which was subsequently incorporated in part in the סדר תנאים ואמוראים (see Ginzberg, p. 305-308); Resp. XXX (p. 340, l. 8-22) on מצה שלכותי which goes perhaps to prove the existence of Samaritans in Babylonia during the Gaonic time, this being substantiated also in other places;²⁰ Resp. XXXIV (p. 341, l. 18—p. 342, l. 3) where mention is made of the רבנן דסיומא whom Ginzberg (p. 315) identifies with the Saboraim,²¹ etc.

However, also in the other fragments there are here and there very interesting Responsa, of which I wish to mention a few: Fr. II Resp. XV (p. 29, l. 26—p. 31, l. 25), the well-known Responsum on סירכא דליבא preserved elsewhere which exhibits here some better readings, as p. 30, l. 17: ואנשי מקצת אנדלם ופרם (in ח"ג, 15 'שבאפס ומקצת אנד' and the addition p. 32, l. 21: 'ורלא כתב לכם וכו') on which see above.—*ib.* Resp. XX (p. 32, l. 28—p. 33, l. 5) on the prohibition of בשר בחלב quoted in *Pardes*, 21b (comp. Epstein in *הגן*, VI, 69 and Aptowitz, *REJ.*, LVII, 249).—*ib.*, Resp. XXIII (p. 33, l. 24—p. 34, l. 8) where mention is made of a query by the people of Baṣra to Naḥshon (a query from Baṣra to Hai p. 71; comp. also p. 212, l. 16; Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.* IV, 104, 216 and above).—*ib.*, Resp. XXVI (p. 35, l. 1—p. 36, l. 25) where Nathan b. Jehiel is mentioned (see above and Aptowitz, *JQR.*, XVIII, 135).—*ib.*, Resp. XLI (p. 40, l. 12—p. 42, l. 21, uncompleted), an explanation of ערונה (Shabbat 84b), which, to judge by the roughness of the language seems to be a translation from the Arabic. The preliminary seven premises (חוק ... מילין מבוססות לה ...)

²⁰ It is strange that Büchler (*REJ.*, XLIII, 57 ff.) does not cite the Gaonic view concerning מצת כותי, which he could have adduced from the Responsum by Jehudai in שערי תשובה, No. 272. He overlooked likewise the most important passage in *Hal. Ged.* 167a (= *Hal. Pesukot*, ed. Schlossberg, p. 83), where it is expressly stated: כותי שקדש חוששין לקדושין היה: מעשה ואצרכיה גיטא מר רב יהודאי ומר רב שמואל.

²¹ There were, however, also in Gaonic times רבנן דסיומא who are quoted in a Responsum by Zadok (שערי צדק, fol. 21a, No. 15) and who were properly the רבנן דדרא דסיומא; see my ענינים שונים, I, 47, and Eppenstein, *Monatsschrift*, LII, 340, whose deductions are not altogether irrefutable.

... ראשון) are reminiscent of Samuel b. Hofni's manner.—Fr. VIII Resp. VI (p. 83, l. 6-11) where Nathan b. Shahriar, the descendant of Bostanai and the Persian princess, is mentioned.—Fr. XII Resp. III (p. 98, l. 15-19) concerning errors to be corrected in a bill of divorce (comp. p. 94).—Fr. XVI Resp. III (p. 141, l. 1—p. 142, l. 9) on an interesting theological problem to which Ginzberg draws a parallel from St. Barnabas (p. 137).—Fr. XIX Resp. II (p. 169, l. 7—p. 173, l. 4) on the orthography of the bill of divorce (in addition to Epstein's treatise in הכרם cited p. 424 comp. also ההוהק, I, 188).—Fr. XXXI Resp. VIII (p. 263, l. 9-13) on the Pentateuch lesson and the Haftarah during the public fasts, which quite deviate from those known heretofore (on which see Ginzberg, p. 260), etc., etc.

Many Responsa contain interesting contributions to the history of civilization in those days and to the customs then prevailing. Of historical data the following may be mentioned: The burning of Haman on Purim (p. 3, on which comp. Friedlaender *JQR.*, N. S., I, 257); the custom to take checks from the bath-keeper or baker in token of having prepaid the price of admission or purchase, explaining the talmudic אסימון (*ib.*, comp. also p. 57, No. 3); concerning a school preceptor who exceeds in chastising small children and the opinion of the Gaon on it (p. 119); the procedure of a bee-keeper (p. 123); Jews had frequently associated with non-Jews in business and thus arose various legal questions concerning the Sabbath and similar things (p. 194, 196; comp. also p. 81 and 263), etc., etc. As to customs having a bearing on the history of religion, the following, though known heretofore, may be dwelt upon: The usage to give a נט קרה resp. נט מקושר had already ceased then (p. 101); for the erection of עירובי חצרות a little flour was gathered from each house on the last day of Passover (p. 121); in taking an oath no Torah scroll was used any longer (p. 154; comp. also Ginzberg's reference p. 146 and Büchler, *REJ.*, XLIII, 52, where much is still to be supplemented); there were especially pious people who also in Babylonia practiced the laws of תרומה and tithes and observed the tenets of purity (p. 221; comp. on this Ginzberg p. 217-218 and the passage from Meiri's מגן אבות, p. 63 cited by Aptowitzer, *Monatsschrift*, LV, 379. The laws of purity were also observed by the Karaites,

but only after Anan, see *REJ.*, XLV, 197, and the Rabbanites endeavored to emphasize that these laws are no more obligatory after the destruction of the temple), etc.

The fragments published here are often, like those in Harkavy's edition, remnants of whole collections and numbered at the margin, allowing us to make some instructive observations. Thus the complete Responsa in Fr. II (i. e. 3-8) exhibit the numeration 17-22, which must be original, since the passages from Yoma explained in them do not follow the order of the Talmud (see p. 7). Furthermore, the Resp. XIX corresponds to ed. Harkavy, No. 30 and Resp. XXII to ed. Hark., No. 31, so that the sources of this edition cannot claim to be the prototypes. It further escaped Ginzberg's attention that numbers 20-22 correspond to the Responsa No. 46-48 in קהלת שלמה, and hence it also follows that in Resp. XXI we are to add the following: וכן מפרש [בבראשית רבה: חמה יש לו נושחוק וכו' גלגל]. What is meant therefore is Gen. r., VI, 6 (concerning the various readings of the word נושחוק see Theodor, *ad loc.*, p. 46) and not the Pesikṭa, ed. Buber, p. 186.—In the indices to Fr. VII (see above) two Responsa are indicated on p. 57 as 3-4, which follow one another in the same order also p. 4 of our volume. On p. 62 correspond again numbers 40-42 to ed. Harkavy, No. 248-250, 48-50 = ed. H., 251-253, 53-56 = ed. H., 254-257, and 58 = ed. H., 258. From this it results once more that the manuscript which served ed. Harkavy as original was copied from another which still contained the numbers 43-47, 51-52, and 57 of our index and which the copyist omitted. The same result is further obtained from Fr. XIX which has preserved at the margin the numeration 55-57 and where the second Resp. = ed. Hark., No. 436 and the fourth = ed. H., 437, hence our third Responsum was missing in the manuscript underlying ed. Hark.—The most comprehensive collection was the one to which Fr. XVII belonged, this fragment having preserved at the margin the numbers 498-505, 568-577, and 585-593 (the intervening numbers form lacunae in our fragment), whereby the collector recorded also on the margin the corresponding Halakot in Maimonides' Code, but in an ignorant or superficial way (see p. 143). The Responsa are abbreviated, almost in the manner of the so-called קצרות ed. Mantua (although without the words תשובה and שאלה), as, for

instance, a comparison of No. 504 with חמדה ננחה, No. 55 will show. The letter כ at the upper end of fol. 1 *recto* designates perhaps the twentieth layer.—A similar numeration with citations from the Halakot of Maimonides is also found in Fr. XXXVII (No. 441-443) which descends perhaps from the same codex as Fr. XVII. On the other hand, Fr. XXX has besides the numeration also the subject of discussion, but not in accordance with the Halakot of Maimonides (סוף עדות קרובים, סוף נכסי מלוג).—In Fr. XXXVI the numeration as well as the number of lines prove that, despite the same manuscript (see p. 280), different, unconnected pieces were here put together. Leaves 1 and 4 undoubtedly belong together, whereby the Responsum on fol. 1 *recto* bearing the number 26 was sent to Judah b. Joseph Alluf at Kairwan, the Resp. on leaf 4, however, as a comparison with ed. Hark., p. 15 shows, to Tlemcen (in accordance with this תשי"ג p. 288, l. 20 is to be emended into תשי"ג, i. e. 1313 Sel. = 1002). Also the ברקה mentioned here is no doubt Barka in northern Africa. Leaf 2 contains the end of a Responsum which was dispatched to Kabes, and the beginning of another which is designated as No. 2. Leaf 3 finally contains the end of a Responsum and the beginning of another which is termed No. 3 (hence cannot be the continuation of the preceding one) and was likewise, as תשובות גמ"מי, 131-134 shows, sent to Tlemcen. All these Responsa were thus sent to Northern Africa and probably all of them come from Hai, but despite all this they are derived from different collections, manifesting once more the strong tie that connected these lands with the Geonim and the intensive activity in forming collections of the Gaonic Responsa. Finally also Fragments III. XV. XVI and XXIX are numbered. But even where the fragments are not numbered we can still arrive at some conclusions from the mere succession of the Responsa. Thus follow, for instance, in Fr. V the second and third Resp. one upon another, exactly as in the fragment published by Harkavy in הפלם, II, 71-77, hence both fragments are derived from the same original. The ninth and tenth Resp. in Fr. XII which deal with quite different matters (ritual and liturgy) correspond to No. 98 and 99 (not 88 and 89) in ed. Mantua, only that they are not Aramaic here as in our fragment, but Hebrew. The manuscript underlying our fragment

was therefore perhaps the source for the collector of the original of ed. Mantua, etc. All these are minutiae which tend to illumine more and more the neglected but important theme of the origin of the various Responsa collections.

A great, perhaps the greatest part, of the Responsa edited in this volume contains explanations to various passages in the Talmud, as may be seen from the index of these passages (p. 409-410) arranged by Ginzberg in a creditable way. However, not only the hermeneutics and the exegesis of the Talmud reaps a rich harvest from this newest Responsa collection, but also its textual criticism, for here we find preserved a whole series of remarkable readings. See, for instance, Ginzberg's remarks on p. 8; p. 91, n. 2; p. 93; p. 129, No. 1; p. 166 and 167, No. 3; p. 242, etc.

The appendix contains the following pieces: Fr. XXXIX-XLIII offer different portions from the She'eltot which are of great importance for the text and composition of this work (see above). Thus Fr. XL, for instance, contains the Derasha to She'elta 43, which is missing in the editions, and besides that a great part of She'elta 44 in an essentially different form than in the editions. Furthermore we find here at the margin of fol. 7 *recto* the following very important note:

¹² H. Tschernowitz (pseud. רב צעיר) who has writtten recently on the She'eltot (השלח, XXV, 1911, p. 538) refuses to admit that we possess this work in an incomplete form, for Ginzberg's publication remained unknown to him. The question already mentioned, why in the She'eltot some, even very important commands, are overlooked, while others, even less important, are discussed several times, is answered by Tsch. to the effect that Aḥa pursued anti-Karaite (properly anti-antitalmudic, since Aḥa had written before the appearance of 'Anan) tendencies, and hence laid especial emphasis on such commands as were not acknowledged by the opponents of tradition. But this seems to me to be without foundation, for in the first place many such commands are missing (as e. g. בשילת לולב, נשילת לולב, etc.), on the other hand even such commands and prohibitions wherein the Karaites concur with the Talmud are treated twice, thus the prohibition to bring cases into non-Jewish courts (comp. Benjamin Nahawendi's בנימין, 1a below; Tsch. calls here for his support the late Aaron b. Elijah). Besides, we hear nothing of anti-traditional sects in Palestine at the time of Aḥa. The presence of Karaites in this land is attested at first by Ben Meir epistles at the beginning of the tenth century.

תרתוב הוּא אלשש (אלשאלתות ר) יקול שלתנ (שאלתא ר) תם יקול
 ברם תם יקול בריך תם יק' ולענין תם יק' דרשא
 is here altogether at the end and not before the end (see
 above). Fr. XLI contains the beginning of a quite unknown
 She'el'ta (it is to be regretted that Ginzberg did not
 print also the halakic and haggadic extracts contained in
 this fragment, see p. 350) and Fr. XLIII has likewise
 an unknown She'el'ta for Yom Kippur,¹² which offers many inter-
 esting details, thus a citation from Midrash Tehillim which is the
 oldest known to us (p. 373, l. 8; the word שמים, however, belongs to
 מספרים, and no conclusion can be drawn therefrom for the divi-
 sion of this Midrash into Sedarim, comp. also Aptowitzer, *Monats-
 schrift*, LV, 634), then the comparison of the repentant to the sinful
 royal son who returns home (p. 377, l. 4) which reminds us of
 the well-known parable in the Gospel, etc. Fr. XLIV contains,
 according to Ginzberg, a piece of the Hal. Ged. in different, char-
 acteristic arrangement. As a matter of fact, however, we have
 here before us, as already mentioned above, a fragment of the
 Aramaic original of the Halakot ed. Schlossberg, fol. 1 correspond-
 ing to ed. p. 85, l. 3 from below—p. 86, l. 21; fol. 2-5 = ed. p.
 87, l. 15-p. 90, l. 9, and fol. 6 = ed. p. 90, l. 2 from bel.—p. 91,
 l. 4 (between fol. 1-2 and 5-6 there are lacunae). I have treated of
 it specifically in *REJ.*, LXIII, 232 ff. and here I only wish to single
 out the following: הַאי נמרא הַיא וְהַיִּידָאנָא בְּבֵית דִּין הַגְּדוֹל בְּתֵרֵין
 (p. 386, l. 7) which ed. Schlossb. p. 88, l. 10 corre-
 sponds to: וְהַ תְּלִמּוֹד [הוּא אַבְל] הַיּוֹם בְּבֵית דִּין הַגְּדוֹל בְּשֵׁנֵי יְשִׁיבּוֹת וְכוּ
 while at the corresponding passage in Hal. Ged. the words בְּבֵית דִּין
 הַגְּדוֹל are missing (see Ginzberg's note *ad loc.*).—Fr. XLVI contains
 a piece from הלכות קצובות ed. Horowitz with a few variants and
 Fr. XLVII a leaf which Ginzberg considers to be a piece from a
 quite unknown version of the Hal. Ged. and in which he sees Pal-
 estinian influences (p. 352). The fragment, however, is too small
 to enable us to render judgment upon it.

The volume closes with an index of the material, which is
 arranged according to the order of the Shulḥan 'Aruk and where
 at the end, as already noted, the Talmud passages commented on
 are recorded (p. 404-410); a general index with Hebrew catch-

words in alphabetic order (p. 411-418); and additions and corrections (p. 419-425). And now finally I wish to add a few single remarks to the whole volume:

P. 16. From the words of our Responsum it cannot be concluded that there existed a commentary by Saadya (not translation) to Chronicles, which is not attested anywhere else, see *JQR.*, X, 248 (so read in Steinschneider, *Arab. Lit. d. Juden*, p. 67, n. 31, instead of 246). Saadya could have given his opinion in a Responsum or in his commentary on Kelim 17, 10, which was perhaps in existence, or somewhere else.—p. 45. As regards Saadya's Responsum on the eating of dead locusts and dead fishes comp. also *ZfhB.*, IV, 74. Comp. in addition the passage in Schechter's *Documents*, I, 12: והרגים לא יאכלו כי ... אם נקדעו חיים ונשפך דמם וכל החגבים במיניהם יבאו באש או במים עד הם חיים וכו' (see *ib.*, p. LI).—p. 49. The insertion of the Shema' in the Kédusha to Musaf is also referred to the persecutions on the part of the Persian king Yezdgerd (שבלי הללם, § 48, comp. also *Eshkol*, ed. Albeck, I, p. 39).—p. 78. The custom to enter in the Ketubba also the woman's garments, furniture, etc. in addition to her dowry, is very old, being found already in the Assuan Papyrus G (ed. Cowley), see *ZfhB.*, XI, 71 below. From the Gaonic time I have published such a Ketubba (*REJ.*, XLVIII, 173) from Fostât dated 1029 (not 1030).—p. 104 below. Here not only the classification of the people according to their social position and vocation is highly interesting from a cultural and historical point of view, but also the designation אנשים (p. 105 above) for people of the middle class (inst. of בינונים).—p. 108. On the custom of pronouncing a blessing over the washing of the hands before the grace after meals on the Passover-night see now Aptowitzer, *REJ.*, LXIII, 125 and the passages recorded there.—p. 110. At the time of Natronai the custom to wear a Tallit was perhaps indeed not universally spread. Of interest is the following Responsum by this Gaon (תשובות נאטוני) והכי אמר רב נטרוני נאון וששאלתם: (שערי תשובה, 88, No. 38; מ"ו) כשיקרא אדם ק"ש צריך לאחוז ארבע ציציותיו או לא דבר זה לא דרך חכמים ותלמידים הוא זה דרך יתירות (יהירות. r) הוא וכו' (שני ספרים חדשים מארץ הגר, p. 10).—p. 180. Through the

Gaonic reading in 'Erubin 53a לשבכתי and שלוכתי instead of לחברתי and שלוכתי, which is also the right one, the hypothesis of B. Lewin (תחכמוני, I, 66) who wanted to explain through it the enigmatic השלכן in the Mesha Stone, is done away with¹⁸ (comp. also Chajes, *Riv. Isr.*, VII, 254).—p. 185, l. 24. This Responsum (and similarly the following one) is found more elaborately and with variants in מעשה הגאונים, ed. Mekize Nirdamim, p. 19 (comp. also *ib.*, p. X, n. 14), where among others משובה stands for שובק.—p. 188. On the puzzling decision of the Gaon who permits to thresh with an ox and a donkey, the ploughing only being forbidden, comp. Aptowitzer, *Monatsschrift*, LV, 639, according to whom this has reference only to the case when the animals are not fastened together. But then the Responsum would have mentioned something about it.—p. 211. That Moses Gaon used Persian words is not at all surprising, for, in the first place, they are derived from the Talmud, and, secondly, even the last Gaon Hai still understood Middle Persian, i. e. Pehlevi, having used Kalila we-Dimna which was composed in this tongue, see ibn Bal'am on Deut. 28, 21 (in Fuchs' *Studien über ibn Bal'am*, I, p. XXI; comp. Steinschneider in החלוץ, II, 62 and Harkavy, *Stud. u. Mitt.*, IV, 371). On the other hand, we have Hai's own testimony that in his days Jews as well as non-Jews in Babylonia spoke Aramaic (see the interesting Responsum, ed. Harkavy, in הקדם, II, 82; comp. on this Chajes, *Riv. Isr.*, VI, 195). In our Responsa Persian words occur also outside of this case (see General Index, s. v. לשון פרסי).—p. 256, l. 15. Here is to be noted the very rare name יצליה which occurs otherwise only in Hefesh b. Yazliah and in Solomon b. Yazliah in MS. Bodl. 2876², see *Riv. Isr.*, VI, 241.—p. 305. Not only in biblical citations the words were abbreviated in such a manner, but also in whole Bible texts, see *JQR.*, VII, 362.—p. 315. That אשיין is the prolongation of אשי I can hardly believe. Krauss (*Lehnwörter*, II, 135) considers it on a par with the Greek 'Ασίας or 'Ασίω; comp. also Bacher, *Monatsschrift*, XLVI, 83.

¹⁸ In the same number (p. 41) Lewin publishes from a manuscript in Parma a brief Responsum by Sherira unknown heretofore. This as well as those published by Harkavy (הקדם, II, 82-87) are to my knowledge the only Gaonic Responsa that have appeared since Ginzberg's publication.

Postscript. Besides the Responsa mentioned in note 13 there has appeared also, since the completion of this review, a small, tolerably interesting collection under the title *Gáoni Responsumok...* kiadta, fordította és magyarázatokkal ellátta Kis Ch. Henrik, Budapest 1912, 35 pp. 8°. These Responsa were derived from two Genizah fragments which had been in the possession of David Kaufmann and on his demise passed into the hands of the Hungarian Academy. The editor, H. Kis, published them as a dissertation for the doctorate of the Budapest University, hence their elaboration is in the Hungarian tongue. The first fragment which consists of two disconnected leaves contains two incomplete Responsa in the domain of civil law, composed in the Arabic language. More interesting is the second fragment which contains sixteen Responsa. The first eight, which are composed in Hebrew, are designated on the margin as No. 94-101; they all come from Hai and they were all sent to one place, probably to Fostat.¹⁴ This follows from the concluding formula of the last Responsum: 'יהי רצון מלפני לזכות אותנו ואתכם בישועתו. וכתב מנשה הכהן ביר' יעקב נ"ע מן כ"ט רבינו הא"י פי דרגה:

They have therefore been copied from Hai's autograph, and indeed through Menasseh ha-Kohen ben Jacob, whose name we find signed under documents of Fostat from the years 1125-35 (MS. Bodl. 2876⁴. 2878⁷; MS. St. Petersburg. B 19a, Cat. Harkavy-Strack, p. 273)—a fact unknown to Kis. Two of these Responsa have been known for a long time, namely Resp. 97 = קהלת שלמה No. 23 (comp. *Monatsschrift*, XLIV, 143) and Resp. 101 = ed. Harkavy 36 (where the concluding formula is fuller: ... יהי רצון רב לראותם בישועתו ובבנין ביתו ובקיבוץ גלויותיו ישע רב. It is shown thereby that this Responsum does not come from Sherira, and accordingly the statement in my ענינים שונים, I, 28 above is to be corrected. Interesting is also No. 98, where the word תתרנית (Baba batra 146a) is explained and where we find among other matters: ... ומי שאיננו מריה כלום נקרא תתן והמכה הזאת נקראת תתרות כאשר מפורש בהלכות יצירה אשר תחלתה בשלשים ושתים נתיבות פליאות חכמה:

¹⁴ Accordingly also these Responsa are to be added to those which were sent by the Geonim to Egypt and which I have registered in *REJ.*, XLVIII, 161; LI, 58.

This word, however, does not occur in our recensions of the *Sefer Yeširah*.—Immediately after these Responsa follow eight more, which are designated on the margin as No. 1-8 and bear the superscription: מן גמלא מסאיל לרבינו סעדיה נאון ז"ל, hence a collection of Saadyanic Responsa. They are all—with the exception of No. 5—in Arabic and otherwise unknown. The following deserve mention: No. 1 which treats of מכת מרדות. The number of strokes, according to Saadya, is thirteen, and these are bestowed on those who transgress a traditional precept, such as hair-cutting on semi-holidays or wearing shoes during the days of mourn-

ing, etc. מכת מרדות מקדארהא תלתה עשר והי תלת אלמלקות ... ונחן). נסתעמלהא פי אלעקובה מן כאלה אלסנה מתלא מן יאכל שעה פי חולו של מועד או ינתעל בנעל פי איאם אלאבל או מא אשבה דלך comp. on the other hand Hai's Responsum in שערי תשובה No. 15 and in addition *Jahrbuch d. jüd.-liter. Gesellschaft*, VIII, 450 and *ZfhB.*, XV, 175). No. 4 deals with the *ajal* problem (see above), which Saadya discusses also in his *Emunot*, ch. VI (ed. Slucki, 102), yet the end seems to have been omitted by the copyist. The Responsum makes reference to the talmudic account of Eleazar b. Simon (Baba meši'a 85a): פי פרק השוכר את הפועלים פי בבא מציעא פי אול אלפרק כולהי שני יסורי דר' אלעזר ברבי שמעון לא שכיב אינש בלא וימניה והדא דליל עלי אן יתופי אלאנסאן בגיר אנלה פיגב אן יקרן בקולהם פי אלאנל לאנהם לא ירו אלמות אלא באנל לקולהם.

In No. 6 Saadya proves that ושאלה (Exod. 3, 22) must be construed in the sense of "asking for a present," with reference to I Sam. 1, 28; Mishnah Shabbat 23, 1, Baba batra 9, 1 and Berakot 29a (שאלה בברכת השנים). This interpretation, as Kis points out, agrees with his translation in the Pentateuch *ad loc.* בתסתוהב (אלמראה), and is quoted by Baḥya b. Asher *ad loc.* in the name of Ḥananel. This is therefore an additional proof that ḥananel in his exposition of the Pentateuch was mostly dependent on Saadya (comp. *Monatsschrift*, XLI, 209, n. 1).